



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,419	06/12/2001	Bill J. Coe	7282.4820	6102
22235	7590	08/17/2004	EXAMINER	
MALIN HALEY AND DIMAGGIO, PA 1936 S ANDREWS AVENUE FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33316			DINH, TIEN QUANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/879,419	COE, BILL J. <i>MU</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tien Dinh	3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Drawings***

The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 3/26/03 have been disapproved because they introduce new matter into the drawings. 37 CFR 1.121(f) states that no amendment may introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application. The original disclosure does not support the showing of elements 100, 102, 110, and 120.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson et al.

Calthrop discloses a parachute having a group of parachute suspension lines and a second member that is a riser both with openings that are attached together by a member but a is silent on the soft link to tie the first and second members together. However, Peterson et al discloses a soft link, one-piece structure 10 with a permanently looped first end 12 (see figure 3) and second looped end 11 having a tab/lump 13. The soft link is made out of rope/high strength material. The first and second end member can be removably attached to each other to define a single continuous loop attachment area so that a first and second member can be connected. When the

first and second member are connected to the attachment point of the first and second end of the body member, first and second member can be cinched because they are tightly attached to each other. Thus, Peterson et al teaches that soft links that can be used to tie the parachute suspension lines to the riser through the openings are well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Peterson et al's soft links in place of Calthrop linking means for easy manufacturing and for saving weight.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder '789 and Peterson et al.

Booth discloses a pilot parachute having a bridle cord 15 and a second member that is a canopy 16 but is silent on the canopy and bridle lines having openings and the soft link to tie the bridle cord and canopy together. However, Peterson et al discloses a soft link, one-piece structure 10 with a permanently looped first end 12 (see figure 3) and second looped end 11 having a tab/lump 13. The soft link is made out of rope/high strength material. The first and second end member can be removably attached to each other to define a single continuous loop attachment area so that a first and second member can be connected. When the first and second member are connected to the attachment point of the first and second end of the body member, first and second member can be cinched because they are tightly attached to each other. Thus, Peterson et al teaches that soft links that can be used to tie the canopy and the bridle through the openings are well known in the art. Furthermore, Snyder '789 teaches canopy and lines which can be interpreted as bridle lines having openings are well known in the art.

Art Unit: 3644

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the canopy and bridle lines have openings (as taught by Snyder) and Peterson et al's soft links in Booth's system to easily attach the canopy to the bridle lines and to easily repair the system if needed.

Claims 15, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop as modified by Peterson et al as applied to claims 10 and 17 above, and further in view of Dennington.

Calthrop as modified by Peterson et al discloses all parts except for the soft link being made out of nylon. However, Dennington discloses that soft links made out of nylon are well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the soft link of Peterson et al out nylon as taught by Dennington to create a stronger structure.

Re claims 16, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used bartack thread in Calthrop's system as modified by Peterson et al to create a stronger structure. Further, the criticality of using bartack thread has not been disclosed.

Re claim 21, please note it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used labels in Calthrop's system as modified by Peterson et al to provide instructions or advertise the brand.

Response to Arguments

The Examiner would like to point out first and foremost that the claims call for a soft link with the intended use being in a parachute system. The Peterson et al reference clearly meets has been claimed. The Examiner used the Caltrop, Snyder, and Booth references to teach that parachute systems are well known in the art.

Now in answering the applicant's arguments on the Booth in view of Peterson et al rejection. The basis of the applicant's argument is that Peterson et al doesn't disclose a soft link that acts as a "shock absorbing device." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The soft link of Peterson is made of rope, cord, or filament. Ropes, cords, or filaments are inherently shock absorbers due to its "string" makeup. Therefore, it is valid to combine Caltrop in view of Peterson et al.

As for the arguments concerning the rejection of claims 1, 8-10, 13, 14, 17, 19, and 20, the Examiner used the Booth reference to disclose that bridle cords, pilot chute and canopy are well known in the art. The introduction of Peterson et al was used to show that a soft link was very known in the art. Snyder was used to show that canopies and lines which can be interpreted as "bridle cords" with openings are well known in the art. When taken in these combinations, they teach what has been claimed.

As for the arguments concerning claims 15, 16, and 21 please note that Dennington was used to show that soft links made out of nylon are well known in the art. Dennington combined with Caltrop and Peterson teaches what has been claimed. Dennington is used to show nylons are commonly used by one skilled in the art.

The Examiner maintains that drawings do introduce new matter and therefore disapproved. Please note that the claims are written with a soft link intended for using in a parachute. This is intended use.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tien Dinh whose telephone number is 703-308-2798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 703-306-4198. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TD

Tue 5/1